

A literature review of intimate partner violence and its classifications

Ali, P¹., Dhingra, K². McGarry, J³

¹*University of Sheffield, Sheffield, United Kingdom*

²*Leeds Beckett University*

University of Nottingham

Correspondence to:

Dr Parveen Ali

The University of Sheffield

The School of Nursing and Midwifery

Barber House Annexe

3a Clarkehouse Road

Sheffield S10 2LA

Tel: +44 (0) 1142222046

Email: parveen.ali@sheffield.ac.uk

ABSTRACT

Intimate partner violence is an important issue and attempts to distinguish typologies of intimate partner violence are necessary to understand the complexities of intimate partner violence, its various causes, correlates, and consequences. Over the last two decades, much research was aimed at classifying types of violence depending on the similarities and differences in patterns of violence. However, it is difficult to find a single account that provides a succinct and up-to-date overview of these classifications. As a result, considerable effort is required to identify and retrieve relevant papers to understand each typology or classification of intimate partner violence. This article provides a succinct and up-to-date integrative review of various classifications of intimate partner violence. Typologies by form of abuse, type of violence, type of perpetrator (men and women) are critically reviewed in the light of available literature and the strengths and limitations of each are described. Recommendations for further research are also provided.

Keywords:

Typologies, intimate partner violence, classification, male perpetrators, female perpetrators

Highlights

- It is often difficult to find an aggregated review of various typologies of IPV
- We present an integrative account of various typologies by form of abuse, type of violence and type perpetrator
- All typologies contribute to our understanding of IPV
- Further research is needed to test these typologies
- Further research is needed to explore if the impact of IPV differs depending on type of IPV

A literature review of intimate partner violence and its classifications

1. INTRODUCTION

Intimate partner violence (IPV) refers to violence between two people involved in an intimate relationship, and it exists in all countries, cultures and societies (Ellsberg et al., 2014). The World Health Organization (2010) defines IPV as “behaviour within an intimate relationship that causes physical, sexual or psychological harm, including acts of physical aggression, sexual coercion, psychological abuse and controlling behaviours” (p. 11). This term helps distinguish IPV from other types of domestic abuse such as child abuse and elderly abuse. The use of this term also acknowledges that violence can be perpetrated by men as well as women without restriction to marital, heterosexual, or homosexual relationships (Anderson, 2002; Archer, 2000, 2002; Brown, 2004; Capaldi, Kim, & Shortt, 2007; Capaldi & Owen, 2001; Hamberger & Potente 1994; Straus & Gelles, 1986).

During the past two decades, numerous typologies of IPV have been suggested: some are based on the characteristics of the violence (Abbott, Johnson, Koziol-McLain, & Lowenstein, 1995; Johnson & Ferraro, 2000; Johnston & Campbell, 1993), while others are based on individual characteristics of the perpetrator (Gottman et al., 1995; Hamberger, Lohr, Bonge, & Tolin, 1996; Holtzworth-Munroe & Stuart, 1994; Miller & Meloy, 2006; Swan, Gambone, Caldwell, Sullivan, & Snow, 2008; Swan & Snow, 2002, 2003, 2006). Some others suggest a combination of these approaches (Chase, O'Leary, & Heyman, 2001; Ross & Babcock, 2009). Attempts to discern typologies of IPV are essential to understand the complexities of IPV (Cavanaugh & Gelles, 2005; Pence & Dasgupta, 2006), its disparate causes, correlates, and consequences (Holtzworth-Munroe & Stuart, 1994). It is likely that the acknowledgment of the multifaceted nature of IPV would greatly

facilitate the development of more appropriate and targeted interventions and more sensitive measurement of the outcomes of such interventions. Perpetrators and their victims (or survivors) represent heterogeneous groups with a multitude of precipitating and exacerbating factors. Recognizing that there may be different typologies of IPV with different etiologies and, therefore, differentially appropriate treatment approaches (Boxall, Rosevear, & Payne, 2015; Capaldi & Kim, 2007; Cavanaugh & Gelles, 2005; Holtzworth-Munroe & Stuart, 1994; Jacobson & Gottman, 1998; Johnston & Campbell, 1993), has the potential to advance our definitions and understanding of IPV and development and empirical assessment of preventive approaches (Johnson, 2010; Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 2010a, 2010b; Langhinrichsen-Rohling, Huss, & Ramsey, 2000a; Pence & Dasgupta, 2006). Developing and understanding typologies of IPV may be useful in developing appropriate and accurate screening instruments, which can be used to assess the risk of IPV (Beck, Anderson, O'Hara, & Benjamin, 2013; Johnston & Campbell, 1993; Kelly & Johnson, 2008; Wangmann, 2011). Such differentiation may also help develop family-law decisions about post-separation parenting (i.e., whether parent-child contact is appropriate, what safeguards may be necessary, and what type of parenting plans are likely to promote healthy outcomes for children and parent-child relationships), by considering the type of IPV and its effect on the victim-parent and the children (Beck et al., 2013; Johnston & Campbell, 1993; Kelly & Johnson, 2008; Wangmann, 2011). However, finding evidence related to each of these different classifications in one article is difficult. Such a review may be particularly useful for novice researchers and practitioners. This paper aims, therefore, to present a rigorous review of various classifications of IPV. Typologies by form of abuse, type of violence, and type of perpetrator (men and women) are critically reviewed in the light of available literature and the strengths and limitations of each are described.

2. METHODS

A search was undertaken of four databases: Medline, CINAHL, Google Scholar and PsychInfo. To identify appropriate studies various search terms including: 'domestic violence' AND 'typology', 'IPV' AND 'typology', 'DV' AND 'typology', 'intimate partner violence' AND 'typology'. Alternative terms for IPV including: 'intimate partner abuse', 'wife abuse', 'spousal abuse', 'women abuse', 'marital violence', and 'marital abuse' were also used. In addition to the Boolean operators, truncation and wildcards techniques were also used. A search was also conducted using Google to identify studies not published in indexed journals. In addition, the reference list of each article was also reviewed to identify studies that may not be listed in databases.

As indicated in Figure 1, through literature searching 250 sources (including primary and secondary sources) were retrieved, scanned, and reviewed and 123 sources have been used in this review. Journal articles published in English in any journal during the period 1980-2015 were included to obtain only current and relevant literature. However, where needed classical work from previous years was also incorporated. Among 123 sources included in this study, 33 sources were published prior to 2000 (1986-2000). In addition, secondary sources such as books were also referred to and included in the review where needed. The review was conducted section-by-section. Each article and book was closely read and the main points and findings, strengths and limitations of each document were summarized.

3. RESULTS

Various typologies are summarized here, according to the focus of the typologies form of abuse, type of violence and the type of perpetrator. We are only presenting most commonly reported and used typologies and it may be that there are some less common typologies missing from this review. These typologies consider different characteristics

such as perpetrator's gender, frequency, severity and intensity of violence, motivation behind the violence, type of violence, physiological responses of perpetrators to different stimuli, and presence of psychopathological factors (Boxall et al., 2015; Capaldi & Kim, 2007; Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 2010a; Langhinrichsen-Rohling, Huss, & Ramsey, 2000b; Wangmann, 2011).

3.1 Typology by Form of Abuse

One way of classifying IPV is by the form of abuse. Understanding various forms of abuse may help in identifying strategies that can be used to tackle each form of abuse. The WHO (2002) classifies IPV into physical, sexual and psychological abuse. Some policy makers have identified other categories, such as economic and social abuse, though, it is not clear, if these subcategories actually exist as separate dimensions of IPV (Hegarty, Sheehan, & Schonfeld, 1999). This classification is frequently used and reported in studies individually as physical violence, psychological violence and sexual violence or in combination (Devries et al., 2013; World Health Organization, 2013).

Physical Violence:

Physical violence refers to the use of physical force to inflict pain, injury or physical suffering to the victim. Slapping, beating, kicking, pinching, biting, pushing, shoving, dragging, stabbing, spanking, scratching, hitting with a fist or something else that could hurt, burning, choking, threatening or using a gun, knife or any other weapon are some examples of physical violence (García-Moreno, Jansen, Ellsberg, Heise, & Watts, 2005).

Sexual Violence:

Sexual violence refers to “any sexual act, attempt to obtain a sexual act, unwanted sexual comments or advances, or acts to traffic, or otherwise directed, against a person's

sexuality using coercion, by any person, regardless of their relationship to the victim, in any setting, including but not limited to home and work” (Jewkes, Sen, & Garcia-Moreno, 2002, p. 149). In the context of IPV, sexual abuse refers to physically forcing a partner, to have sexual intercourse, who did not want it, forcing a partner to do something that she found degrading or humiliating (García-Moreno et al., 2005), harming her during sex or forcing her to have sex without protection (World Health Organization, 2014).

Psychological Violence:

Psychological violence refers to the use of various behaviors intended to humiliate and control another individual in public or private. Examples of psychological violence include, verbal abuse, name calling, constantly criticizing, blackmailing, saying something or doing something to make the other person feel embarrassed, threats to beat women or children, monitoring and restricting movements, restricting access to friends and family, restricting economic independence and access to information, assistance or other resources and services such as education or health services (Follingstad & DeHart, 2000; WHO, 2002).

3.2 Typology by Type of Violence

Kelly and Johnson (2008) maintain that IPV is not a “... unitary phenomenon and that different types of partner violence [are]... apparent in different contexts, samples, and methodologies” (Kelly & Johnson, 2008, p. 480). Among various typologies offered by type of violence, the most widely used include Johnson’s (1995) and Johnston’s (1993) typology and these are discussed here.

Johnson’s Typology

Michael Johnson, an American sociologist, has been working on the typology of violence since early 1990s and over time, and with colleagues, he has developed and

refined his proposed typology (Johnson, 1995; Johnson, 2008; Kelly & Johnson, 2008). His work has been identified as the most influential of the typologies proposed so far (Anderson, 2009; Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 2010a). Johnson maintains that the perspective of both feminist and family researchers can be appropriate in explaining IPV (Abbott et al., 1995). The feminist perspective identifies violence as a tactic used by men to control and dominate their partner within a heterosexual relationship; whereas, researchers from the family perspective maintain that IPV is an outcome of the conflict in couples and can be present in both heterosexual and same-sex relationships. In addition, from the family perspective, women can also perpetrate violence against their male partners (Straus, 2006). Johnson (1995) initially proposed two forms of IPV, patriarchal terrorism, and common couple violence. The typology, since then, has been expanded and according to Johnson and colleagues (Abbott et al., 1995; Johnson, 2000; Johnson & Ferraro, 2000; Kelly & Johnson, 2008), IPV can be classified into five qualitatively different types. These include Coercive Controlling Violence (CCV), Violent Resistance, Situational Couple Violence (SCV), Mutual Violent Control Violence, and Separation-Instigated Violence (Beck et al., 2013). The distinctions in these types were not based on a single incident, but a general pattern of control in the relationship between intimate partners (Johnson & Ferraro, 2000).

Coercive Controlling Violence (CCV)

CCV refers to a pattern of emotionally abusive intimidation, coercion, and control combined with physical violence perpetrated against intimate partner (Kelly & Johnson, 2008, p. 478). It refers to a pattern of control and manipulation by a partner against their intimate partner. A person controls their spouse's actions, relationships, and activities. The coercive partner keeps the victim under surveillance, and failure to follow the rules established by them often results in punitive action (Beck et al., 2013; Kelly & Johnson, 2008; Tanha, Beck, Figueredo, & Raghavan, 2009). Major forms of violence, as shown in

the power and control wheel, include intimidation, emotional abuse, isolation, minimizing, denying, and blaming, use of children, asserting male privilege, economic abuse, and coercion and threats (Pence & Paymar, 1993). Johnson maintains that the abuser may use one or a combination of several tactics to keep the victim under control. Johnson (1995) initially used the term 'Patriarchal Terrorism' for this type of violence. The next term used was 'Intimate Terrorism,' and that was later changed to Coercive Controlling Violence (CCV). This type of violence is more severe, occurs more frequently and escalates over time (Johnson & Leone, 2005; Kelly & Johnson, 2008; Leone, Johnson, Cohan, & Lloyd, 2004). CCV is the type of IPV that is most frequently encountered in agency settings, such as law enforcement, the courts, shelters, and hospitals (Kelly & Johnson, 2008). In heterosexual relationships, CCV is most often perpetrated by men. Johnson (2006), for instance, found that 97% of the CCV in the Pittsburgh sample were male-perpetrated, while Graham-Kevan and Archer (2003) reported that 87% of CCV in their British sample was male-perpetrated. Existence of male perpetration of CCV was also supported by recent studies (Ansara & Hindin, 2009, 2011; Beck et al., 2013; Gulliver & Fanslow, 2015). Little systematic research has been undertaken on women's use of CCV, but some studies have identified women as perpetrators of this type of violence in both heterosexual and same-sex relationships (Beck et al., 2013; Hines, Brown, & Dunning, 2007; Migliaccio, 2002; Renzetti, 1992).

Violent Resistance

This refers to the type of violence used by the victim of violence to resist violence from a coercive controlling partner. Various terms that have been used to describe this type of violence include Female Resistance, Resistive/Reactive Violence and Self-Defense (Beck et al., 2013; Kelly & Johnson, 2008). Feminist researchers consider all types of violence perpetrated by women against their male partner as a form of female resistance

and, therefore, use the term battered women syndrome (Walker, 1984; Yllö & Bograd, 1988). However, unlike feminist researchers, Johnson acknowledges that violence can be perpetrated by women against their intimate partners and suggests that the term violence resistance, better reflects the fact that a man or women can resort to violence in an attempt to stop the violence or to stand up for themselves (Kelly & Johnson, 2008). Women's Violent Resistance rarely leads to encounters with law enforcement due to its short-lived nature. For many women, resorting to self-protective violence may be almost automatic and emerge as soon as the coercively controlling and violent partner begins to use violence. However, in heterosexual relationships, most women find out quickly that responding with violence is ineffective and may in fact make the situation worse (Pagelow, 1981). For example, the using data from the National Crime Victimization Survey, Bachman and Carmody (1994) indicate that women who defend themselves against attacks from their intimate partners are twice as likely to sustain injury as those who do not. Though much research has been conducted to explore the violent resistive behavior of females, particularly women who murder their intimate partners (Browne, 1987; Browne, Williams, & Dutton, 1999; Ferraro, 2006), research on men's resistive behavior is still limited.

Situational Couple Violence (SCV)

The SCV is defined as the type of violence between partners when an individual can be violent and non-controlling in a relationship with a nonviolent partner or a violent but non-controlling partner (Johnson, 2006). It is the most common type of violence in the general population and can be perpetrated by men or women against their partner. The intention behind this type of violence is not power, control or coercion; it arises from situations, arguments and conflicts between partners, which then escalate into physical violence (Kelly & Johnson, 2008). This results from one or both partner's inability to

manage conflict or anger (Ellis & Stuckless, 1996; Johnson, 2006; Johnston & Campbell, 1993). The frequency and intensity of violence tends not increase over time and usually involves minor forms of violence compared with CCV. SCV may encompass verbally abusive acts such as cursing, shouting, name calling, and accusations of infidelity. However, it does not have a chronic pattern of controlling, intimidating, and stalking behaviors, which is a characteristic of CCV (Kelly & Johnson, 2008). This type of violence was initially named Common Couple Violence, and terms such as Male-Controlling Interactive Violence, and Conflict Motivated Violence (Ellis & Stuckless, 1996, 2006) have also been used to refer to this type of violence (Kelly & Johnson, 2008). Large general population-based studies indicate that SCV is initiated at similar rates by men and women. For instance, Straus and Gelles (1992) found male rates of violence toward a partner of 12.2% and female rates of 12.4%. In a survey of cohabiting and married respondents, males reported one-year rates of male-to-female violence of 12.9% and female respondents reported female-to-male violence of 12.5% (Kwong, Bartholomew, & Dutton, 1999).

Mutual Violent Control Violence

This type of violence occurs when both partners are violent and controlling towards each other (i.e., two intimate terrorists)(Beck et al., 2013). It is this type of violence, which supports the notion of gender symmetry in the phenomenon of IPV. It is considered a rare type of violence and little is known about its features, frequency and consequences (Johnson, 2000; Johnson & Ferraro, 2000; Kelly & Johnson, 2008). Consistent with this finding, only four percent of the sample in a recent study was identified under this category (Beck et al., 2013). However, in a recent study, 70% (n=624) of the sample was identified as mutually violent (Leonard, Winters, Kearns-Bodkin, Homish, & Kubiak, 2014).

Separation-Instigated Violence

Separation-Instigated Violence occurs in couples who are in the process of separation and divorce (Johnston & Campbell, 1993). Such couples do not normally have a history of violence in their intimate relationship and the violent episodes are triggered in response to traumatic experiences at the time of separation. Such experiences include finding the home empty after the spouse's (and perhaps, children's) departure, humiliation and insult faced as a result of separation and divorce (especially if the person is a known figure), and allegations of sexual abuse (Johnston & Campbell, 1993). The violence in such situation, represents an atypical and serious loss of psychological control that is sometimes also described as 'just going nuts'. Such violence is typically limited to one or two mild to more severe forms of violence episodes during the separation period (Kelly & Johnson, 2008, p. 487). Seen symmetrically in both men and women, this type of violence is more likely to be perpetrated by the spouse who has been left and/or is shocked by divorce action. The various ways a person may react include lashing out, throwing objects at the spouse, destroying property and trying to intimidate the spouse or her new partner through various actions such as sideswiping (to strike along the side in passing) or damaging their car (Kelly & Johnson, 2008).

As mentioned previously, the Johnson's focus is not the seriousness or frequency of violence, but in the presence or absence of control (Johnson & Leone, 2005), though physical violence is present in all five types. Johnson (1993) tested his theory by conducting a secondary analysis of the 'Pittsburgh data' composed of community and clinical (court and shelter) samples. The findings revealed that men and women in the community sample were more likely to use SCV (86% of the cases), when men and women were compared in the clinical samples. Johnson's typology has been supported by some researchers (Ansara & Hindin, 2009, 2011; Beck et al., 2013; Frye, Manganello,

Campbell, Walton-Moss, & Wilt, 2006; Graham-Kevan & Archer, 2003; Pence & Dasgupta, 2006). However, there has been some criticism of Johnson's typology and its various aspects (Meier, 2015). Further research to test Johnson's typology is recommended (Beck et al., 2013; Gulliver & Fanslow, 2015; Hines & Douglas, 2010).

Johnston's Typology

Janet Johnston and colleagues attempted to differentiate types of IPV in the context of custody and access disputes (Johnston & Campbell, 1993). The authors studied divorcing parents involved in disputes over parenting following relationship breakdown in two different research studies involving 80 parents and 100 children in one study and 60 parents and 75 children in another. The authors derived five types of IPV on the basis of three primary motivations for the use of violence. These included ongoing and episodic male battering, female initiated violence, separation-engendered violence, male-controlling interactive violence, and violence due to psychotic and paranoid reactions (Johnston & Campbell, 1993). There are similarities and overlaps in the work of Michael Johnson and Janet Johnston.

Episodic Male Battering

Episodic male battering, as the name suggests, is initiated by men against their partner and may be present in up to 18% of high-conflict divorcing families (Johnston & Campbell, 1993). It is similar to CCV identified by Johnson (Kelly & Johnson, 2008). Female initiated violence may be present in 15% of high-conflict divorcing families. Moderately severe violence can occur if the perpetrator loses control while restraining the attacking spouse (Johnston & Campbell, 1993).

Separation-Engendered Violence

Separation-engendered violence occurs only during or after the separation period with no violence during the marriage itself. It can be present in up to 25% of high-conflict divorcing families. The physical violence is generally initiated by the partner who feels deserted and this can be either the man or the woman (Johnston & Campbell, 1993). This is similar to Kelly and Johnson's (2008) separation-instigated violence.

Male Controlling Interactive Violence

Male controlling interactive violence arises from mutual verbal arguments and insults progressing to physical struggles. It can be seen in up to 20% of high-conflict divorcing families. Violence can be initiated by either partner; however, the man may physically dominate or overpower the woman. In addition, a woman's struggles and counterattacks may result in the man becoming more dangerous and threatening (Johnston & Campbell, 1993). This type of violence is similar to SCV (Kelly & Johnson, 2008).

Psychotic and Paranoid Reactions

Finally, psychotic and paranoid reactions are a result of disordered thinking and paranoia. They can be present in up to 65% of high conflict divorcing families (Johnston & Campbell, 1993). The authors acknowledge limited generalizability of the findings due to small sample size and chronic history of litigation and high frequency of conflicts between these couples. Johnston & Campbell's (1993) typology has not been tested and has received limited attention in the literature.

3.3 Typology by Perpetrator: Men

Researchers have offered typologies of male perpetrators who are aggressive to their female partners (Gondolf, 1988; Gottman et al., 1995; Hamberger & Hastings, 1986; Hamberger et al., 1996; Holtzworth-Munroe & Stuart, 1994; Riggs, 1993; Rouse, 1990;

Vivian & Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 1994), to help with the treatment and rehabilitation programs for male perpetrators. In the following, an overview of a few of the more widely used typologies is presented. The term perpetrator and batterer is used interchangeably.

Holtzworth-Munroe's Typology

Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994) proposed a typology, developed through a comprehensive review of 15 previous perpetrator typologies, which classified IP based on characteristics of the perpetrator rather than of the violence itself. The authors (1994) offered three subtypes of perpetrators: family only, dysphoric–borderline and generally violent–antisocial men. The authors maintain that the three subtypes differ from each other on the basis of the severity and frequency of the violence, the generality of the violence (only within the family or outside the family), and the batterer's psychopathology or emotional dysfunction. Other researches have supported Holtzworth-Munroe's (1994, 2000) typology (Hamberger et al., 1996; Langhinrichsen-Rohling et al., 2000a; Lawson et al., 2003; Tweed & Dutton, 1998; Waltz, Babcock, Jacobson, & Gottman, 2000; Wray, Hoyt, Gerstle, & Leitman, 2015). Extending the typology, the authors (Holtzworth-Munroe, Meehan, Herron, Rehman, & Stuart, 2000) added another subtype known as low level anti-social perpetrators which has also been supported through research (Huss & Ralston, 2008; Loinaz, 2014; Thijssen & de Ruiter, 2011). However, evidence about the stability of these typologies is relatively weak as it is difficult to distinguish between generally violent and borderline/ dysphoric men (Holtzworth-Munroe, Meehan, Herron, Rehman, & Stuart, 2003). A study using latent class analysis in community sample could identify only three types, namely family only, medium violence, and generally violent/psychologically distressed. Their study did not find distinct groups of the borderline / dysphoric and generally violent/antisocial types (Delsol, Margolin, & John, 2003). It is also important to note, however, that these typologies were developed based on

male perpetrators of female partners. Consequently, it is not clear how these typologies map onto female perpetrators of IPV and therefore, further research is needed.

Family only

The family-only (FO) type of perpetrator is also called the moderately violent offenders. Perpetrators in this subtype, are least likely to: exert severe and frequent violence; engage in criminal behavior; use violence outside the home; and display traits of psychopathology or personality disorder. In addition, they are the least likely of the subtypes to have substance abuse problems. The FO perpetrators infrequently engage in IPV consisting of psychological and sexual abuse, and they are the most likely to apologize after being violent. FO perpetrators are inappropriately assertive in their relationship and tend to misinterpret social cues. Consequently, they resort to violence rather than appropriate non-violent means to resolve conflicts with their partners. Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994) estimated the prevalence of this subtype to 50% in populations of IPV perpetrators. In a review of nine IPV typology studies, Dixon and Browne (2003) reported similar prevalence rates for this subtype. Furthermore, Thijssen and de Ruiter (2011) concluded that the IPV recidivism rate for this subtype was seven percent.

Dysphoric–Borderline Batterers

The dysphoric–borderline (DB) perpetrators engages in moderate to severe IPV. They are mainly violent towards their intimate partner with some degree of involvement in violence outside the home. Their IPV is considered more severe than the FO perpetrators and may involve both psychological and sexual abuse (Holtzworth-Munroe & Stuart, 1994). In terms of psychopathology, the DB perpetrator displays traits of dysphoria or traits of borderline personality disorder (BPD). These perpetrators are also the most psychologically distressed and emotionally volatile of the three subtypes evidencing delusional jealousy, problems with substance abuse, and a fear of separation from their

partners. Their anger is generalized and explosive in nature and is likely to be displayed anytime they become frustrated. Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994) estimated the prevalence of this subtype to be 25% in populations of IPV perpetrators. However, Dixon and Browne (2003) reported a prevalence of 20% for this subtype. Thijssen and de Ruiter (2011) found 16% of DB perpetrators recidivated in IPV. Some other studies have reported slightly higher rate (37%) of recidivism in this group (Eckhardt, Holtzworth-Munroe, Norlander, Sibley, & Cahill, 2008)

Generally Violent and Anti-social Batterers

The third subtype, generally violent and anti-social batterers (GV/A), is described as the most violent category. They engage in a frequent and severe intrafamilial violence, including psychological and sexual abuse. Furthermore, the GV/A perpetrators often engage repeatedly in severe extra-familial violence as well as exhibit more general criminal behavior. They are more likely to use weapons and more prone to inflict severe injury on partners and other family members. They are also most likely to be diagnosed with either antisocial personality disorder (APD) or psychopathy, and have alcohol and drug abuse problems. Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994) estimated the prevalence of this subtype to be 25% in populations of IPV perpetrators, whereas Dixon and Browne (2003) reported a prevalence of 30% for this subtype. Thijssen and de Ruiter (2011) found a recidivism rate of 19%.

Low Level Anti-Social Batters

This subtype was introduced in the year 2000, much later than the initial typology was proposed. The authors maintain that low level anti-social (LLA) batterers fall between the FO and GV/A perpetrator, thus exhibiting moderate extrafamilial as well as intrafamilial violence (Holtzworth-Munroe et al., 2000). The LLA perpetrator is likely to demonstrate previous registered criminality, although to a lesser extent than the GV/A

perpetrator. Furthermore, the LLA perpetrator is unlikely to display psychopathological traits or traits of personality disorder to the same extent as the DB and the GV/A perpetrator (Holtzworth-Munroe et al., 2000). Thijssen and de Ruiter (2011) reported a prevalence of 24% for the LLA perpetrator in their sample and a recidivism rate of 14% in IPV for this subtype.

Holtzworth-Munroe and colleagues (2000) suggested the conceptualization of three violent subtypes (FO, LLA and GV/A on a continuum of anti-sociality (Holtzworth-Munroe et al., 2000). The authors acknowledged that the fourth subtype i.e., DB could not be placed on the continuum. Some studies have supported the batter typology proposed (Hamberger, Lohr, Bonge, & Tolin, 1996; Waltz, Babcock, Jacobson, & Gottman, 2000), while other research has not (Holtzworth-Munroe & Meehan, 2004; Ziegler, 2005), and Huss and Ralston (2008) questioned whether subtypes actually matter. They found no differences in treatment-related outcomes (treatment completion, immediate treatment response, recidivism) among the three (1994) subtypes.

Jacobson and Gottman's Typology

Another typology is the one proposed by Jacobson and Gottman (1998) who examined physiological changes in male perpetrators when they used violence. Violence was defined as physical aggression with a purpose to control, intimidate, and subjugate another person. "Battering is always accompanied by emotional abuse, is often accompanied by injury, and is virtually always associated with fear and even terror on the part of battered women" (p. 25). Jacobson and Gottman (1998) recruited couples via public advertisements and allocated them into groups depending on the pattern of male partner's use of violence. One group ($n = 63$) consisted of perpetrators who evidenced 'low level violence', including perpetrators whose partners reported six or more violent acts- in the past year- such as pushing or slapping, or two or more acts of 'high-level violence',

such as kicking or hitting with a fist. The second group ($n = 27$) consisted of men who displayed 'some violence', but insufficient to be classified as 'battering'. The third group ($n = 33$) involved couples dissatisfied with their marriage, but there was no evidence of violence and the fourth group ($n = 20$) involved happily married couples (Jacobson & Gottman, 1998). The authors used various data collection methods, including laboratory observations of non-violent arguments, structured interviews with male perpetrators and their female victims, psychiatric assessment of both partners, and assessment of both partners 'emotional arousal at the physiological level' (heart rate, blood flow, bodily movement, sweating) during an argument. The last stage was videotaped and played back to participants who were asked to describe how they had been feeling at various stages during the argument. Most of these steps were repeated two years later to assess relationship stability and use of violence. Jacobson and Gottman (1995, 1998) identified two types of perpetrators, including the 'cobras' and 'pit bulls'.

Type I perpetrators: The Cobra

Type I batterers were named cobras and they exhibited a decrease in heart rate as they became verbally aggressive. The cobras accounted for 20% of the perpetrators examined in the study. The authors maintained that Type I batterers were anti-social, extremely violent, and emotionally abusive (Jacobson & Gottman, 1998). They were violent outside their intimate relationship; however, their intimate partners were less likely to leave the relationship. In fact, none of the couples separated two years later compared with 50% of the pit bulls whose relationship ended in the same period.

Type II perpetrators: The Pit Bull

The type II batterers were named Pit bull, and these men built up their anger during an argument. Unlike cobras, their heart rate increased during an argument. These men were 'emotionally dependent on their wives, they feared 'abandonment' and, therefore, were

likely to have ‘jealous rages’ and to seek to ‘deprive their partners on an independent life’ (Jacobson & Gottman, 1998, p. 38). They displayed moderate levels of violence in their intimate relationships, but were less likely to be violent outside of their family.

Control appeared to be a central feature of the violence for both groups described by Jacobson and Gottman (1998), as the author’s state, “The Pit Bulls dominate their wives in any way they can and need control as much as the cobras do, but for different reasons. The Pit Bulls are motivated by a desire to get as much immediate gratification as possible” (Jacobson & Gottman, 1998, p. 38). The cobras appeared to resemble the GV/A male perpetrators (Holtzworth-Munroe & Meehan, 2004; Holtzworth-Munroe et al., 2000); whereas, the pit bull resemble the DB perpetrators (Holtzworth-Munroe & Stuart, 1994). However, Jacobson and Gottman’s (1998) typology could not be replicated or supported by further research (Babcock, Green, Webb, & Graham, 2004; Babcock, Green, Webb, & Yerington, 2005; Meehan, Holtzworth-Munroe, & Herron, 2001).

3.4 Typology by Perpetrator: Women

Over the years, there has been a growing recognition and acknowledgement that women can also be violent towards their male partners (Anderson, 2002; Archer, 2000, 2002; Brown, 2004; Capaldi et al., 2007; Capaldi & Owen, 2001; Dasgupta, 2002; Hamberger & Potente, 1994; Straus & Gelles, 1986). However, it is also established that women are much more likely to be injured and injured severely than men (Archer, 2000; Swan & Snow, 2002, 2003). Researchers have attempted to explore, contextualize, and examine the motivations for, and impact of, IPV, especially in response to the higher arrest rate of women in the U.S. as a result of changes in the mandatory arrest laws (Babcock, Miller, & Siard, 2003; Bair-Merritt et al., 2010; Hines & Douglas, 2010; Miller & Meloy, 2006; Swan & Snow, 2002, 2003). Researchers, depending on their ideology, have identified various motivations of use of IPV by women. For instance, family researchers

have argued that men and women have similar motivations such as anger and a desire to resolve disagreements (Straus, 2005), or a desire to exert power and control (Rosen, Stith, Few, Daly, & Tritt, 2005; Seamans, Rubin, & Stabb, 2007). However, feminist researchers believe that women use violence as a mean of self-defense, and in response to the abuse, protection of children and retaliation (Dasgupta, 2002; Dobash & Dobash, 2004; Swan & Snow, 2006). Evidence suggests that though the rate of violence by men or women may be the same, the ways violence is used may be different (Miller & Meloy, 2006). For instance, men are more likely to use sexual coercion and coercive control against their partners, whereas, it is important to understand the role of victimization in understanding the women's motivation to use violence (Swan et al., 2008). In addition, women's violence is generally less frightening to men than vice versa (Swan & Snow, 2002, 2003). In the following, typologies that have been proposed to explain women's use of violence are discussed.

Swan and Snow's Typology

Swan and Snow (2002, 2003) in their research involving 108 women who had used IPV in the past six months, explored women's experience of victimization and perpetration of IPV (physical violence, sexual violence, emotional abuse, injury and coercive control). The authors identified three subtypes, which include victims, abused aggressors, and mixed relationships (mixed male coercive relation or mixed female coercive relationship).

Victims

This type refers to women who were violent, but their partners were not only much more abusive but used more severe violence against them. Thirty four percent of the sample ($n = 108$) belonged to this category (Swan & Snow, 2002). This category was subdivided into two types. The type A male partners committed more of every type of violence than their female counterpart; whereas, type B partners committed more severe

violence and were more coercive against their female partners. However, women committed equal or greater moderate violence and/or emotional abuse against their male counterparts. For these women, self-defense was the main reason for the use of IPV (Swan & Snow, 2002, 2003).

Aggressor

This category referred to women who were much more abusive than their partners, and it accounted for 12% of the study sample. The women used both physical violence and coercive control against their male partner. This category was also divided into two subtypes. The 'type A' women were those who used more of all types of violence against their male partners. The type B women aggressor were those who used greater levels of severe violence and coercion, but their partner committed equal or more moderate violence and/or emotional abuse. The intention behind the use of IPV for these groups of women was retribution and control (Swan & Snow, 2003).

Mixed Relationships

The third category consisted of women in mixed relationships and this accounted for 50% of the study participants. Thirty two percent of the women were in a mixed male coercive relationship and 18% of the women were in mixed female coercive relationships (Swan & Snow, 2003). The women in mixed male coercive relationships were equally or more violent than their male partners, though the partners were more coercive than the women themselves. On the other hand, for women in mixed female coercive relationships, women were equally or more coercive than their male partners, but the male partners were more violent than the women.

Miller and Meloy's Typology

Suzanne Miller and Michelle Meloy studied 95 female offenders who had been ordered to attend treatment programs as part of their probation following conviction for a domestic violence offense (Miller & Meloy, 2006). They explored the context of IPV and proposed three categories of abusive women, which included generalized violent behavior, frustration response, and defensive behavior.

Generalized Violent Behaviour

This category referred to the women who were generally violent in their life in and outside family life. However, these women did not exert control over their intimate partners; "... in fact, the victims did not fear them nor change their behavior out of a sense of intimidation – responses that would be typical in a scenario with female victims abused by men" (Miller & Meloy, 2006, p. 98) .

Frustration Response Behaviour

Women in this category were those who exhibited violent behavior in response to abuse by their partner. This group accounted for 30% of the women in the sample. These women had a history of experiencing abuse from their current or former partner and these women had responded with violence- unsuccessfully- after trying other measures to stop violence (Miller & Meloy, 2006). However, the use of violence by these women did not change their partner's abusive behavior or the power dynamics of their relationship.

Defensive Behaviour

Women in this category were those who used violence as a form of self-defense. They used violence in situations where they knew their partner was about to become more violent. Most of these women used violence in order to protect their children. About 65% of the women in the sample fell into this category.

Miller and Meloy (2006) tried to compare their typology with Johnson's typology. They believed that the category of defensive behavior was similar to the category of 'violent resistance'; whereas, the category of generally violent behavior is similar to the category of 'mutual violent control' (Kelly & Johnson, 2008). The authors concluded that using a one-size-fits-all approach may not be useful in distinguishing and dealing with real perpetrators and victims who resort to violence in self-defense or other relevant reasons (Miller & Meloy, 2006).

A review of the research related to typologies of violent women highlights that there are three types of women perpetrator of violence. The first type is about women who use violence as self-defense (Conradi & Geffner, 2009; Dieten, Jones, & Rondon, 2014; Hamberger & Guse, 2002; Miller & Meloy, 2006). The second type consists of women who use violence and exert power and control in a mutually violent relationship (Conradi & Geffner, 2009; Dieten et al., 2014; Johnson, 1995). The third type consists of women who are the primary perpetrators of violence (Conradi & Geffner, 2009; Dieten et al., 2014; Henning, Martinsson, & Holdford, 2009).

4. DISCUSSION

This paper aimed to review common typologies of violence. It is clear from the above-mentioned review that there is an agreement that not all IPV is the same and that men and women differ in terms of their motives to use violence and the ways that they use violence. However, "... it is not entirely clear whether and how these typologies fit together. Are the researchers describing the same categories? Are there any differences? Are these differences important and do they require further investigation?" (Wangmann, 2011, p. 11). All of these typologies mentioned above reveal a convergence between categorization (Cavanaugh & Gelles, 2005).

There are many similarities between various types. For instance, the category of FO perpetrator described by Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart is similar to Johnson's SCV (Holtzworth-Munroe & Meehan, 2004; Johnson & Ferraro, 2000). In addition, the other two types (antisocial and dysphoric—borderline) are similar to CCV (Johnson & Ferraro, 2000). Whereas, the category of CCV and SCV is thought to be similar to the Johnston and Campbell's (1993) categories of 'male battering' and 'male controlling interactive violence' respectively (Kelly & Johnson, 2008). Table 1 demonstrates the similarity between these types. It is clear from the above discussion and from the following Table that Johnson's typology of IPV is the most comprehensive classification that helps us to understand the phenomenon of IPV in different circumstances, situations and perspectives. Another example is the research conducted by Cavanaugh and Gelles (2005) who explored perpetrators typologies of Gondolf (1988), Gottman et al. (1995), Hamberger et al. (1996), Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994) and (Johnson, 1995). The authors identified three types of perpetrators common in all typology research and these were low, moderate and high risk offenders (Capaldi & Kim, 2007; Cavanaugh & Gelles, 2005). This refined typology is supported through recent research (Graña, Redondo, Muñoz-Rivas, & Cantos, 2014). This typology may be useful, but supports the concern that there is a lack of evidence about the distinction of different types and consequently utility of these types. As Capaldi and Kim (2007) mention that typological approach would have been more convincing and useful if different types of perpetrators showed more distinctive association patterns of related factors. There are many other areas that still need further consideration. For instance, there is still a need to explore and compare the use and motives of violence by men and women. There is also a need to examine the potential varying consequences of different forms of IPV between the genders. Available evidence suggests that women victims of CCV were likely to suffer injuries, manifest symptoms

post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), use painkillers, take time off from work, attempt to leave their partner and seek refuge accommodation on multiple occasion (Johnson & Leone, 2005). There is still a need to explore victims' perceptions about different types of IPV (Wangmann, 2011) and if the impact of different types of IPV is different on children (Haselschwerdt, 2014; Jouriles & McDonald, 2015).

There have also been many concerns in relation to the development of typologies and their practical application. There are concerns related to the definition of coercive control, consideration of context, overemphasis on physical violence and practical use of typologies. One of the important methodological concerns raised about various typologies is about how coercive control is defined and measured (Wangmann, 2011). Coercive control remains a central focus on many typologies (Johnson, 2008; Johnston & Campbell, 1993; Swan & Snow, 2002, 2003). However, control is often operationalized and measured as a discrete item in addition to other discrete items such as physical, psychological or sexual IPV, rather than as an overarching theme explaining various acts that might be used in a relationship to exert control and to dominate and abuse the victim (Wangmann, 2011). Swan and Snow (2003) acknowledge considering control as a discrete item and the fact that they did not take account of context or impact of coercive acts. Not considering the context and the impact of IPV can lead to misidentification of an action. For instance, a woman's threat to leave her partner if he doesn't stop violence can be seen as a control item, rather than an acceptable action (Dutton & Goodman, 2005). Understanding the context of an action is important to assess and ascribe meaning to an incident of violence (Dobash & Dobash, 2004). In addition, differentiation between controlling behavior is another issue. For instance, Johnson in his secondary analysis of the data, defined high control by the presence of three or more control items (Johnson, 2008). Such an approach has been criticized as it considers each control item of an equal weight. It may be that

presence of any control item should be identified as control not just three or more items (Frye et al., 2006). It may also be worth exploring if it is the control that should be the focus of research as various forms of IPV are usually an attempt to exert control and to get the victim to confirm (Anderson, 2008). The issue related to defining, measuring coercive control is the current focus of research, and it's only recently that researchers have started acknowledging that instead of treating coercive control as a separate variable it is important to explore and understand contextual, interdependent and interactive nature of coercive control (Dutton & Goodman, 2005).

Another important concern is that most of the typologies put great emphasis on physical violence, thus overlooking or under-acknowledging the importance of other forms of violence and abuse. For instance, Johnson's typology only refers to physical violence and the presence or absence of coercive control. In fact, women who do not experience physical violence are not identified as IPV victims in Johnson's typology, even when they experience high levels of controlling behavior (Anderson, 2008; Johnson, 2008). Similarly, physical violence remains the defining characteristic (Johnston & Campbell, 1993; Miller & Meloy, 2006).

With regards to practical application of these typologies, it is not clear how to use them in practice, and how to classify abuse into different forms. Do victims in a relationship only experience one type of violence? Do practitioners working with IPV victims find these typologies useful? Boxall et al. (2015) recently explored the use of typologies, perceived benefits and challenges associated with the use of domestic violence typologies by domestic violence practitioners/ professionals in Australia. The findings revealed that typologies are not used in practice and that the DV practitioners felt typologies were abstract, risky and 'unwieldy' to everyday practice. There are no tools available to help practitioners use different typologies and differentiate between them

(Boxall et al., 2015; Holtzworth-Munroe & Meehan, 2004; Wangmann, 2011). There is a risk of misidentification of violence and, therefore, compromising the safety of the victim. For instance, a case of CCV could be wrongly assessed as SCV (Pence & Dasgupta, 2006). Similarly, it may difficult to assess IPV experiences that do not fit in with the description of already defined categories. Over reliance on typologies may result in reinforcement of myths and stereotypes leading to misidentification and mismanagement of the IPV cases. For instance, typologies may reinforce myths such as violence is a relationship issue or that men and women are equally violent (Wangmann, 2011). The application and relevance of typologies to different populations is another concern. Evidence developing typologies and the research exploring support and the application of the typologies is U.S based and therefore, generalizability and the relevance of these typologies to other countries and context may be limited (Boxall et al., 2015; McPhedran & Baker, 2012; Wangmann, 2011). As such, the available evidence suggests that the typologies are not much used in clinical and/ or professional practice and this mean that typologies are much more theoretical with less practical relevance, something that needs to be explored and developed.

This paper provided an overview of the most common perpetrator typologies. Such a review may be very useful for novice researchers and practitioners in understanding of available typologies. The review also highlights the strengths and limitations of the available research and highlights areas of investigation. The review of the existing literature identifies several areas for further research. First, although the literature above offers preliminary support for the existence of IPV typologies, further research exploring and empirically validating these typologies is needed. Such work should consider the correlates and consequences of these typologies, and may provide valuable information for developing specific primary and secondary interventions targeted at specific subtypes of

IPV. The potentially differential effects of these targeted interventions on different typologies of IPV could then be rigorously assessed. Second, prior research suggests that the risk of child abuse and maltreatment increases in families where there is IPV. However, it is not clear if there is a difference in the impact depending on the type of IPV experienced by partners, and how this may differ by culture. Further research is also required to explore the relevance and generalizability of the typology in different countries and contexts outside U.S. Research is also needed to explore the relevance and clinical utility of such typologies from the perspective of practitioners providing services to IPV victims and perpetrators.

5. CONCLUSION

The significance of the current review is that it clarifies that IPV perpetrators and their victims represent significantly diverse groups with a multitude of precipitating and exacerbating factors. We consider that acknowledging that there may be different typologies of IPV with different etiologies, correlates, and consequences and, therefore, differentially appropriate treatment approaches, has the potential to advance not only our definitions and understanding of IPV but also the development and empirical assessment of targeting intervention and prevention approaches. We suggest that increasing research focused on exploring and empirically validating IPV typologies (in different context and populations), particularly Johnson's typology, is a promising direction for improving efforts to ultimately prevent IPV.

References

- Abbott, J., Johnson, R., Koziol-McLain, J., & Lowenstein, S. R. (1995). Domestic violence against women: Incidence and prevalence in an emergency department population. *JAMA*, 273(22), 1763-1767. doi: 10.1001/jama.1995.03520460045033
- Anderson, K. L. (2002). Perpetrator or victim? Relationships between intimate partner violence and well-being. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 64(4), 851-863.
- Anderson, K. L. (2008). Is Partner Violence Worse in the Context of Control? *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 70(5), 1157-1168. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3737.2008.00557.x
- Anderson, K. L. (2009). Book Review: A Typology of Domestic Violence: Intimate Terrorism, Violent Resistance, and Situational Couple Violence. *Contemporary Sociology: A Journal of Reviews*, 38(6), 532-533. doi: 10.1177/009430610903800612
- Ansara, D. L., & Hindin, M. J. (2009). Exploring gender differences in the patterns of intimate partner violence in Canada: a latent class approach. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, jech. 2009.095208.
- Ansara, D. L., & Hindin, M. J. (2011). Psychosocial consequences of intimate partner violence for women and men in Canada. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 26(8), 1628-1645.
- Archer, J. (2000). Sex differences in aggression between heterosexual partners: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 126, 651-680.
- Archer, J. (2002). Sex differences in physically aggressive acts between heterosexual partners: A meta-analytic review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 7(4), 313-351.
- Babcock, J. C., Green, C. E., Webb, S. A., & Graham, K. H. (2004). A Second Failure to Replicate the Gottman et al. (1995) Typology of Men Who Abuse Intimate Partners...and Possible Reasons Why. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 18(2), 396-400. doi: 10.1037/0893-3200.18.2.396
- Babcock, J. C., Green, C. E., Webb, S. A., & Yerington, T. P. (2005). Psychophysiological Profiles of Batterers: Autonomic Emotional Reactivity as It Predicts the Antisocial Spectrum of Behavior Among Intimate Partner Abusers. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 114(3), 444-455. doi: 10.1037/0021-843X.114.3.444
- Babcock, J. C., Miller, S. A., & Siard, C. (2003). Toward A Typology Of Abusive Women: Differences Between Partner-Only And Generally Violent Women In The Use Of Violence. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 27(2), 153-161. doi: 10.1111/1471-6402.00095
- Bair-Merritt, M. H., Shea Crowne, S., Thompson, D. A., Sibinga, E., Trent, M., & Campbell, J. (2010). Why Do Women Use Intimate Partner Violence? A Systematic Review of Women's Motivations. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 11(4), 178-189. doi: 10.1177/1524838010379003
- Beck, C. J., Anderson, E. R., O'Hara, K. L., & Benjamin, G. A. H. (2013). Patterns of intimate partner violence in a large, epidemiological sample of divorcing couples. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 27(5), 743.
- Boxall, H., Rosevear, L., & Payne, J. (2015). Domestic Violence Typologies: What Value to Practice? *Trends & Issues in Crime and Criminal Justice*(494), 1.
- Brown, G. (2004). Gender as a factor in the response of the law-enforcement system to violence against partners. *Sexuality and Culture*, 8, 3-139.
- Capaldi, D., Kim, H., & Shortt, J. (2007). Observed initiation and reciprocity of physical aggression in young, at-risk couples. *Journal of Family Violence*, 22, 101-111.

- Capaldi, D., & Owen, L. D. (2001). Physical aggression in a community sample of at-risk young couples: Gender comparisons for high frequency, injury, and fear. *Journal of Family Psychology, 15*, 425-440.
- Capaldi, D. M., & Kim, H. K. (2007). Typological approaches to violence in couples: A critique and alternative conceptual approach. *Clinical psychology review, 27*(3), 253-265.
- Cavanaugh, M. M., & Gelles, R. J. (2005). The utility of male domestic violence offender typologies. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 155*-166. doi: 10.1177/0886260504268763 20:
- Chase, K. A., O'Leary, K. D., & Heyman, R. E. (2001). Categorizing partner-violent men within the reactive-proactive typology model. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 69*(3), 567-572. doi: 10.1037/0022-006X.69.3.567
- Conradi, L., & Geffner, R. (2009). Introduction to Part I of the Special Issue on Female Offenders of Intimate Partner Violence. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma, 18*(6), 547-551. doi: 10.1080/10926770903120143
- Dasgupta, S. D. (2002). A Framework for Understanding Women's Use of Nonlethal Violence in Intimate Heterosexual Relationships. *Violence Against Women, 8*(11), 1364-1389. doi: 10.1177/107780102237408
- Delsol, C., Margolin, G., & John, R. S. (2003). A typology of maritally violent men and correlates of violence in a community sample. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 65*(3), 635-651.
- Devries, K. M., Mak, J. Y., García-Moreno, C., Petzold, M., Child, J. C., Falder, G., . . . Rosenfeld, L. (2013). The global prevalence of intimate partner violence against women. *Science, 340*(6140), 1527-1528.
- Dieten, M. V., Jones, N. J., & Rondon, M. (2014). Working With Women Who Perpetrate Violence: A Practice Guide.
- Dixon, L., & Browne, K. (2003). The heterogeneity of spouse abuse: A review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 8*(1), 107-130.
- Dobash, R. P., & Dobash, R. E. (2004). Women's Violence to Men in Intimate Relationships: Working on a Puzzle. *British Journal of Criminology, 44*(3), 324-349. doi: 10.1093/bjc/azh026
- Dutton, M., & Goodman, L. (2005). Coercion in Intimate Partner Violence: Toward a New Conceptualization. *Sex Roles, 52*(11-12), 743-756. doi: 10.1007/s11199-005-4196-6
- Eckhardt, C., Holtzworth-Munroe, A., Norlander, B., Sibley, A., & Cahill, M. (2008). Readiness to change, partner violence subtypes, and treatment outcomes among men in treatment for partner assault. *Violence and Victims, 23*(4), 446-475.
- Ellis, D., & Stuckless, N. (1996). *Mediating and negotiating marital conflicts*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ellis, D., & Stuckless, N. (2006). Separation, domestic violence, and divorce mediation. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly, 23*(4), 461-485.
- Ellsberg, M., Arango, D. J., Morton, M., Gennari, F., Kiplesund, S., Contreras, M., & Watts, C. (2014). Prevention of violence against women and girls: what does the evidence say? *The Lancet, 385*(9977), 1555-1566. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(14)61703-7
- Follingstad, D. R., & DeHart, D. D. (2000). Defining psychological abuse of husbands toward wives: Contexts, behaviors, and typologies. *J Interpers Violence, 15*(9), 891-920. doi: 10.1177/088626000015009001
- Frye, V., Manganello, J., Campbell, J. C., Walton-Moss, B., & Wilt, S. (2006). The Distribution of and Factors Associated With Intimate Terrorism and Situational Couple Violence Among a Population-Based Sample of Urban Women in the United

- States. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 21(10), 1286-1313. doi: 10.1177/0886260506291658
- García-Moreno, C., Jansen, H. A. F. M., Ellsberg, M., Heise, L., & Watts, C. (2005). *WHO multi-country study on women's health and domestic violence against women: Initial results on prevalence, health outcomes and women's responses* Geneva: World Health Organization.
- Gondolf, E. W. (1988). Who Are Those Guys? Toward a Behavioral Typology of Batterers. *Violence and Victims*, 3(3), 187-203.
- Gottman, J. M., Jacobson, N. S., Rushe, R. H., Wu Shortt, J., Babcock, J., La Taillade, J. J., & Waltz, J. (1995). The relationship between heart rate reactivity, emotionally aggressive behavior, and general violence in batterers. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 9(3), 227-248.
- Graham-Kevan, N., & Archer, J. (2003). Intimate terrorism and common couple violence: A test of Johnson's predictions in four British samples. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 18(11), 1247-1270. doi: 10.1177/0886260503256656
- Graña, J. L., Redondo, N., Muñoz-Rivas, M. J., & Cantos, A. L. (2014). Subtypes of Batterers in Treatment: Empirical Support for a Distinction between Type I, Type II and Type III. *PloS one*, 9(10), e110651.
- Gulliver, P., & Fanslow, J. L. (2015). The Johnson typologies of intimate partner violence: an investigation of their representation in a general population of New Zealand women. *Journal of Child Custody*, 12(1), 25-46.
- Hamberger, L. K., & Guse, C. E. (2002). Men's and Women's Use of Intimate Partner Violence in Clinical Samples. *Violence Against Women*, 8(11), 1301-1331. doi: 10.1177/107780102762478028
- Hamberger, L. K., & Hastings, J. (1986). Personality correlates of men who abuse their partners: A cross-validation study. *Journal of Family Violence*, 1(4), 323-341. doi: 10.1007/BF00978276
- Hamberger, L. K., Lohr, J. M., Bonge, D., & Tolin, D. F. (1996). A large sample empirical typology of male spouse abusers and its relationship to dimensions of abuse. *Violence and Victims*, 11, 277-292.
- Hamberger, L. K., & Potente, T. (1994). Counseling heterosexual women arrested for domestic violence: Implications for theory and practice. *Violence and Victims*, 9, 125-137.
- Haselschwerdt, M. L. (2014). Theorizing children's exposure to intimate partner violence using Johnson's typology. *Journal of Family Theory & Review*, 6(3), 199-221.
- Hegarty, K., Sheehan, M., & Schonfeld, C. (1999). A multidimensional definition of partner abuse: Development and preliminary validation of the composite abuse scale. *Journal of Family Violence*, 14(4), 399-415.
- Henning, K., Martinsson, R., & Holdford, R. (2009). Gender Differences in Risk Factors for Intimate Partner Violence Recidivism. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*, 18(6), 623-645. doi: 10.1080/10926770903103248
- Hines, D., Brown, J., & Dunning, E. (2007). Characteristics of callers to the domestic abuse helpline for men. *Journal of Family Violence*, 22(2), 63-72.
- Hines, D. A., & Douglas, E. M. (2010). Intimate Terrorism by Women Towards Men: Does it Exist? *Journal of aggression, conflict and peace research*, 2(3), 36-56. doi: 10.5042/jacpr.2010.0335
- Holtzworth-Munroe, A., & Meehan, J. C. (2004). Typologies of Men Who Are Maritally Violent: Scientific and Clinical Implications. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 19(12), 1369-1389. doi: 10.1177/0886260504269693

- Holtzworth-Munroe, A., Meehan, J. C., Herron, K., Rehman, U., & Stuart, G. L. (2000). Testing the Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994) batterer typology. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 68*(6), 1000-1019. doi: 10.1037/0022-006X.68.6.1000
- Holtzworth-Munroe, A., Meehan, J. C., Herron, K., Rehman, U., & Stuart, G. L. (2003). Do subtypes of maritally violent men continue to differ over time? *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 71*(4), 728.
- Holtzworth-Munroe, A., & Stuart, G. L. (1994). Typologies of male batterers: Three subtypes and the differences among them. *Psychological Bulletin, 116*, 476-497.
- Huss, M. T., & Ralston, A. (2008). Do Batterer Subtypes Actually Matter? Treatment Completion, Treatment Response, and Recidivism Across a Batterer Typology. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 35*(6), 710-724. doi: 10.1177/0093854808316218
- Jacobson, N., & Gottman, J. (1998). *When men batter women: new insights into ending abusive relationships*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Jewkes, R., Sen, P., & Garcia-Moreno, C. (2002). Sexual violence. In E. G. Krug, L. L. Dahlberg, J. A. Mercy, A. B. Zwi, & R. Lozano (Eds.), *World report on violence and health* (pp. 149-181). Geneva: World Health Organization.
- Johnson, M. P. (1995). Patriarchal terrorism and common couple violence: Two forms of violence against women. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 57*(2), 283-294.
- Johnson, M. P. (2000). Conflict and control: Images of symmetry and asymmetry in domestic violence. In A. C. C. A Booth, & M Clements (Ed.), *Couples in conflict*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Johnson, M. P. (2006). Conflict and control: Gender symmetry and asymmetry in domestic violence. *Violence Against Women, 12*(11), 1003-1018. doi: 10.1177/1077801206293328
- Johnson, M. P. (2008). *A typology of domestic violence: intimate terrorism, violent resistance and situational couple violence*. Lebanon: Northeastern University Press.
- Johnson, M. P. (2010). Langhinrichsen-Rolling's confirmation of the feminist analysis of intimate partner violence: comment on "Controversies involving gender and intimate partner violence in the United States". *Sex Roles, 62*(3-4), 212-219.
- Johnson, M. P., & Ferraro, K. J. (2000). Research on domestic violence in the 1990s: Making distinctions. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 62*(4), 948-963.
- Johnson, M. P., & Leone, J. M. (2005). The differential effects of intimate terrorism and situational couple violence: Findings from the national violence against women survey. *Journal of Family Issues, 26*(3), 322-349. doi: 10.1177/0192513x04270345
- Johnston, J. R., & Campbell, L. E. G. (1993). A clinical typology of interparental violence in disputed-custody divorces. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 63*(2), 190-199.
- Jouriles, E. N., & McDonald, R. (2015). Intimate partner violence, coercive control, and child adjustment problems. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 30*(3), 459-474.
- Kelly, J. B., & Johnson, M. P. (2008). Differentiation among types of intimate partner violence: research update and implications for interventions. *Family Court Review, 46*(3), 476-499.
- Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J. (2010a). Controversies involving gender and intimate partner violence in the United States. *Sex Roles, 62*(3-4), 179-193.
- Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J. (2010b). Controversies involving gender and intimate partner violence: Response to commentators. *Sex Roles, 62*(3-4), 221-225.
- Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J., Huss, M., & Ramsey, S. (2000a). The Clinical Utility of Batterer Typologies. *Journal of Family Violence, 15*(1), 37-53. doi: 10.1023/A:1007597319826

- Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J., Huss, M. T., & Ramsey, S. (2000b). The clinical utility of batterer typologies. *Journal of Family Violence*, 15(1), 37-53.
- Lawson, D. M., Weber, D., Beckner, H. M., Robinson, L., Marsh, N., & Cool, A. (2003). Men Who Use Violence: Intimate Violence Versus Non-Intimate Violence Profiles. *Violence and Victims*, 18(3), 259-277. doi: 10.1891/vivi.2003.18.3.259
- Leonard, K. E., Winters, J. J., Kearns-Bodkin, J. N., Homish, G. G., & Kubiak, A. J. (2014). Dyadic patterns of intimate partner violence in early marriage. *Psychology of violence*, 4(4), 384.
- Leone, J. M., Johnson, M. P., Cohan, C. L., & Lloyd, S. E. (2004). Consequences of Male Partner Violence for Low-Income Minority Women. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 66(2), 472-490.
- Loinaz, I. (2014). Typologies, risk and recidivism in partner-violent men with the B-SAFER: a pilot study. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 20(2), 183-198.
- McPhedran, S., & Baker, J. (2012). Lethal and Non-Lethal Violence Against Women in Australia Measurement Challenges, Conceptual Frameworks, and Limitations in Knowledge. *Violence Against Women*, 18(8), 958-972.
- Meehan, J. C., Holtzworth-Munroe, A., & Herron, K. (2001). Maritally violent men's heart rate reactivity to marital interactions: A failure to replicate the Gottman et al. (1995) typology. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 15(3), 394-408. doi: 10.1037/0893-3200.15.3.394
- Meier, J. S. (2015). Johnson's Differentiation Theory: Is It Really Empirically Supported? *Journal of Child Custody*, 12(1), 4-24.
- Migliaccio, T. A. (2002). Abused Husbands: A Narrative Analysis. *Journal of Family Issues*, 23(1), 26-52. doi: 10.1177/0192513x02023001002
- Miller, S. L., & Meloy, M. L. (2006). Women's Use of Force: Voices of Women Arrested for Domestic Violence. *Violence Against Women*, 12(1), 89-115. doi: 10.1177/1077801205277356
- Pence, E., & Dasgupta, S. (2006). Re-examining 'battering': are all acts of violence against intimate partners the same?
- Pence, E., & Paymar, M. (1993). *Education groups for men who batter: The Duluth model*. New York: Springer.
- Renzetti, C. M. (1992). *Violent betrayal: Partner abuse in lesbian relationships*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Riggs, D. S. (1993). Relationship Problems and Dating Aggression. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 18-35. doi: 10.1177/088626093008001002 8:
- Rosen, K. H., Stith, E. S. M., Few, A. L., Daly, K. L., & Tritt, D. R. (2005). A Qualitative Investigation of Johnson's Typology. *Violence and Victims*, 20(3), 319-334. doi: 10.1891/vivi.20.3.319
- Ross, J., & Babcock, J. (2009). Proactive and Reactive Violence among Intimate Partner Violent Men Diagnosed with Antisocial and Borderline Personality Disorder. *Journal of Family Violence*, 24(8), 607-617. doi: 10.1007/s10896-009-9259-y
- Rouse, L. P. (1990). The dominance motive in abusive partners: Identifying couples at risk. *Journal of College Student Development*, 31, 330-335
- Seamans, C. L., Rubin, L. J., & Stabb, S. D. (2007). Women Domestic Violence Offenders: Lessons of Violence and Survival. *Journal of Trauma & Dissociation*, 8(2), 47-68. doi: 10.1300/J229v08n02_04
- Straus, M. (2005). Women's violence toward men is a serious social problem. In D. Loseke, R. Gelles, & M. Cavanaugh (Eds.), *Current controversies on family violence*. London: Sage.

- Straus, M. A. (2006). Future Research on Gender Symmetry in Physical Assaults on Partners. *Violence Against Women*, 12(11), 1086-1097. doi: 10.1177/1077801206293335
- Straus, M. A., & Gelles, R. J. (1986). Societal Change and Change in Family Violence from 1975 to 1985 as Revealed by Two National Surveys. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 48(3), 465-479.
- Swan, S. C., Gambone, L. J., Caldwell, J. E., Sullivan, T. P., & Snow, D. L. (2008). A review of research on women's use of violence with male intimate partners. *Violence and Victims*, 23(3), 301.
- Swan, S. C., & Snow, D. L. (2002). A Typology of Women's Use of Violence in Intimate Relationships. *Violence Against Women*, 8(3), 286-319. doi: 10.1177/107780120200800302
- Swan, S. C., & Snow, D. L. (2003). Behavioral and Psychological Differences Among Abused Women Who Use Violence in Intimate Relationships. *Violence Against Women*, 9(1), 75-109. doi: 10.1177/1077801202238431
- Swan, S. C., & Snow, D. L. (2006). The Development of a Theory of Women's Use of Violence in Intimate Relationships. *Violence Against Women*, 12(11), 1026-1045. doi: 10.1177/1077801206293330
- Tanha, M., Beck, C. J. A., Figueredo, A. J., & Raghavan, C. (2009). Sex Differences in Intimate Partner Violence and the Use of Coercive Control as a Motivational Factor for Intimate Partner Violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, -. doi: 10.1177/0886260509354501
- Thijssen, J., & de Ruiter, C. (2011). Identifying Subtypes of Spousal Assaulters Using the B-SAFER. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 26(7), 1307-1321. doi: 10.1177/0886260510369129
- Tweed, R. G., & Dutton, D. G. (1998). A Comparison of Impulsive and Instrumental Subgroups of Batterers. *Violence and Victims*, 13(3), 217-230.
- Vivian, D., & Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J. (1994). Are Bi-Directionally Violent Couples Mutually Victimized? A Gender-Sensitive Comparison. *Violence and Victims*, 9, 107-124.
- Walker, L. E. (1984). *The battered woman syndrome*. New York: Springer.
- Waltz, J., Babcock, J. C., Jacobson, N. S., & Gottman, J. M. (2000). Testing a typology of batterers. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 68(4), 658-669. doi: 10.1037/0022-006X.68.4.658
- Wangmann, J. M. (2011). Different Types of Intimate Partner Violence - An Exploration of the Literature Retrieved 28 March, 2016, from http://www.adfvc.unsw.edu.au/PDF%20files/IssuesPaper_22.pdf
- WHO. (2002). World report on violence and health: Summary. . Geneva: WHO.: World Health Organization
- World Health Organization. (2010). Preventing intimate partner and sexual violence against women: taking action and generating evidence. Geneva: World Health Organisation and London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine.
- World Health Organization. (2013). *Global and regional estimates of violence against women: prevalence and health effects of intimate partner violence and non-partner sexual violence*: World Health Organization.
- World Health Organization. (2014). Health care for women subjected to intimate partner violence or sexual violence: a clinical handbook.
- Wray, A. M., Hoyt, T., Gerstle, M., & Leitman, B. (2015). Examining Intimate Partner Violence Types in a Diverse Sample of Court-Referred Parenting Dyads. *Journal of Child Custody*(just-accepted).

Yllö, K., & Bograd, M. (1988). *Feminist perspectives on wife abuse* Newbury Park, CA Sage.




Figure 1: Flow chart of Study Inclusion and Exclusion

Table 1: A comparison of various typologies of IPV

<i>Johnson's typology</i>	<i>Johnston & Campbell, (1993)</i>	<i>Holtzworth-Munroe & Stuart (1994)</i>	<i>Gottman et al. (1995)</i>	<i>Swan & Snow, 2002</i>	<i>Miller & Meloy, 2006</i>
Coercive Controlling Violence (CCV)	Episodic male battering Psychotic and Paranoid Reactions	Antisocial Dysphoric—borderline	Type I—Cobra Type II—Pit bull	Abused Aggressor	
Situational Couple Violence (SCV)	Male controlling interactive violence	Nonpathological		Mixed relationships	
Separation-Instigated Violence	Separation-Engendered violence				
Violent Resistance	Female initiated violence			Victims	Defensive behavior
Mutual violent control					Generalized Violent Behavior Frustration Response

